

The Republican.

No. 7, VOL. 8.] LONDON, Friday, August 22, 1823. [PRICE 6d.

TO THE REPUBLICANS OF THE ISLAND OF ALBION.

Dorchester Gaol, August 19, Year 4,

CITIZENS, *of the Spanish Revolution.* RUMOURS upon rumours float about Spain, and something decisive must soon be heard. Out of Revolution good must eventually come: and if the evil triumphs but for a moment, it is but to exhibit itself as a mark for future necessary destruction.

Reports of the triumph of the Royalists and Priests in Spain have been lately very frequent; but this cannot be lasting: they are a known evil, and must, and will, be destroyed sooner or later. To ask a sensible man to support such a thing is to ask him to work to his own injury: and if he be promised a reward he must see, that such a reward cannot be given to a number sufficient to support such a system.

Speculation as to what will happen this or next month in Spain is now become idle: we must wait for events and judge as they come. I am of opinion, that the Whigs and the Tories of this country have coalesced to work the modification of the Spanish Constitution: and to render the Spanish Aristocracy more worthless by making them hereditary Legislators. However let us have patience: popular knowledge they can no longer controul.

I defer my letter to Mr. George Harris another week, to work up the correspondence on hand: after which I shall want all the space in these pages for several weeks to come. So Correspondents must not feel disappointment.

RICHARD CARLILE.

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 5, Water Lane, Fleet Street.

ORGANIZATION—INTELLECT.

DEAR SIR, London, July 31, 1823.
THE observations in this interesting question in your last
Republican, and that characteristic love of truth and anxious
spirit to promote enquiry, which mark your manner of in-
troducing it to our notice, has induced me to send you the
following remarks.

In this disquisition, I comprehend by the term “*organization*,” the physical or material powers or capabilities of that part of the human machine, denominated mind; and in this abstract view of its nature, I recognize it to be a combination of quiescent and pre-existing faculties, perfectly independent of all those exterior objects of impression, whose *after* operations develope the character and extent of ability of these faculties, and alone constitute our experience of even their existence. The term *intellect* is frequently used also to designate the physical properties of mind, and in this sense is only synonymous with *organization*; but I intend to treat of it in the present instance, as being the result of impressions, made on quiescent organization by causes existing independent of itself, and of the reflective associations of other sensations that necessarily arise from such a mechanism so impressed—constituting what we term consciousness, intelligence, thoughts and feeling.

The true application of mental organization to the discussion before us, necessarily involves two very important, but distinct features for consideration; first, its original capacity for acquiring and retaining ideas, or sensations, and combinations of sensations, being the knowledge of things;—and, second, the pre-established disposition, on the part of this organization, to use that knowledge to the practical or moral welfare, or injury, of the individual being it identifies, or to that of those other beings, it is necessitated to associate with.

Let us then first examine the subject with reference to the strength or weakness of the *material* capabilities of mind; and the query which here presents itself, is, Are all human minds, constructed by nature *a priori*, with a uniformity of strength and capacity, to acquire and retain impressions? To this your friendly correspondent has endeavoured to give an affirmative answer; and, on the contrary, you observe, that to ascribe the differences we actually witness to any thing short of physical arrangements, would be

like saying "that education would make the lion a lamb, or the sheep a goat." Now, notwithstanding I agree as I shall attempt presently to shew, with the main principle of your argument, I must beg to observe, that this appears to me not a correct analogical conclusion. The enquiry under review, is not whether education can change the primary constitution of a particular organization, either of a man or a lion, but whether it be capable of developing a similitude of character and powers in beings endued with sufficient *general* properties of conformation, to constitute a distinct race of animals. Your conclusion strikes me as a very pointed begging of the question, if not a gratuitous and too hasty decision of it. You will probably reply that having demonstrated a fact, it might be admissible to challenge its overthrow by a reference, as well to one impossibility, as to another; to the general truth of this proposition I readily accede; but in the present instance, your decision rests solely on the contemplation of the *existence* of certain effects, and overlooks the *cause*, which is the fact in dispute. Again, it might be fairly objected to you that although education cannot possibly convert the destruction-empowered jaw, or death-grasping talons of the lion, into the imbecile conformation of the lamb, yet has it been able by a course of domesticating treatment almost to extirpate some of its most savage propensities, by generating a lamb-like gentleness, and as it were to change the essential character of its very nature.

But are all minds by *nature* equally capacitated? Experience and the most attentive observation, I think prove the contrary; admitting as I readily do, the full force of all the influence and bias of circumstances in the formation of those striking differences we discover in the energies and display of intellectual powers, still I cannot divest myself of the conviction, that a considerable share of the discrepancies are mainly attributable to primitive nature. It seems only necessary to cast our eyes among any or all the arts, the professions, or even among the common and daily intercourse of social transactions, to be instantly struck, with the contrast exhibited of *active superiority* between individuals engaged in similar avocations, were the intensity of *interested motive*, one would conclude must be very similar; for it is upon the power of *excited* interest, your Correspondent places the force of his argument, in his examples of education, and certainly it is in the activity of such motives, operating upon different individuals in a com-

mon pursuit, that we shall be best able to mark the character of the energies displayed.

Perhaps no profession offers a more ready example, than that of a barrister in a court of law, where the most tortuous ingenuity of intellect is exhibited, and where often the greatest strength of mind is called into play from the difficulty to misrepresent circumstances and to distort facts—and here, while one man by the superior exercise and developement of his perceptions, shall almost make falsehood, truth, and vice, virtue; another shall ruin his own cause by a blundering struggle in its support and perhaps too with even more interested anxiety than his successful compeer. I am aware, that this appearance does not amount to a demonstration of the *original* cause; I offer it only as one argument of probability, which it would be easy to multiply, while it may be observed, that men who discover great clearness of mind, in one branch of learning will also exhibit a similar degree of perfection in any other they might be led to engage in. I know there are apparent exceptions to this, but I write generally. I wish distinctly to be understood to confine this reasoning, to the *originally formed material* powers of mind, or their natural aptitude to be operated upon by independent impulses, as well as their capacity to treat on these impulses, thereby creating an *intellect* for the practical business of life; and here I cordially echo the belief of your friend, “*that intellect* is as much a result of certain modes of manufacturing, as any piece of machinery is.” But this *intellect*, it should be recollect, is only the material manufactured, and not the machine itself which originally produced it; the not having kept this distinction in view, appears to have led to some erroneous reasoning in the examples of education before alluded to. Let us again revert to the educating two or more boys, and let us observe the developement of the *facility* with which they receive or acquire a new perception, and if any difference exhibits itself in this particular, I think we should be nearer the probability of truth in ascribing it to organization, than to any other cause; your Correspondent says, no—it is because the stimulus excited by the preceptor or other circumstances was stronger in one boy’s mind, than in the other’s. If this were really the cause we should sometimes find a boy who had at one time shown himself deficient to another, in some particular branch of instruction, would at another time as much excel him in some other branch; but this we find to be by no means the case, and I conclude that a real superiority

evinced by some boys over others, taken promiscuously from a larger number, would be always uniformly conspicuous in any new exercise they might be mutually engaged in; nor will a single instance of teaching be sufficient, but a successive course of opportunities will be necessary, to enable the observer to see the full force of these different organizations.

When we see that nature sometimes "curtails man of his fair proportions" of exterior senses, as well as of bodily symmetry, why is it unreasonable to assign to her, the productions of different degrees of susceptibility and opacity, of strength and weakness, in the composition of the *internal* sense or senses. It seems to me more important that a correct probability should be established on this head of the subject, on account of its influence on the methods of tuition, than on any other; for who can tell when a supposition of the equality of the strength of youthful minds, has existed in that of the preceptor, what cruel treatment may not have been inflicted for imagined inattention or carelessness to the worse than useless suffering for the unfortunate child, and to the certain suspension, and perhaps blighting, the progressive blossoming of his young intellect.

In establishing the inequality of mental strength in the bosom of nature as we at present perceive her to exist, we do not in the least degree impugn the omnipotent force, education offers as an infallible corrective, and to a certain extent equalizer; and to the full value of this force so justly supported by your friend, I sincerely subscribe my faith.

Having shown that mental functions differ in degrees of practicability, the next query is, does education really offer a guarantee for the progress of *all* minds? Most assuredly, yes. Can then all those minds of the inferior order of capabilities, and which we have seen, to present some difficulties to their own advancement, be made to go forward rather than backward in the march of improvement? Yes, certainly, but not in an equal ratio, as to time and facility, with minds more happily organized. This we may also exemplify by reverting once more to youthful instruction, and remark that although while one boy will become a perfect master of a subject, before another will have gained the first rudiments, yet the latter may doubtless become a proficient also, by dint of a closer and longer application to study; and in short it seems clear, that no species of science or information, can be above the grasp of any mind not belonging to an absolutely "defective animal." You appear to dispute

this force of education, by saying "education is wholly a *moral power*; I speak of *physical power*." "And I can only admit my friend's arguments as applicable to the matter in question, when I am taught there is no difference nor distinction, in moral and physical power." This strikes me again as being another begging of the question, for while it may be clearly demonstrated that much dissimilitude does actually exist, in the *original* physical organic powers of different individuals—it certainly cannot be as clearly proved, that a correct application of the "*moral power*" of education, would not to a very great extent, remove these original differences, and remodel as it were even that primitive mechanism by which all moral agency is created. That the physical strength of the mind's capacity augments with every new acquisition of ideas, or with every new exercise of its functions, few will dispute, if at all conversant with the operation of intense thinking, much less a mind experienced like your own; and although we are not yet enabled to explain the precise degree of identity, or relation which exists between the *moral power* acting, and the *physical power* acted on, we have only to look into our own minds to perceive, that the action of this moral power, or in other words the action of thought upon our whole being is *peculiarly material* in all its effects; and is in reality, nothing but the reaction of a discovered principle upon the faculties which gave it birth, proving, if not an actual similitude of natures, an immutable reciprocity of influence in their operations: but you will perhaps say we cannot give by the force of education, an eye or an ear to beings naturally destitute of them. This must be granted while at the same time it may be hinted, as we pass, that some astonishing discoveries have of late years been made, in the sciences of anatomy and surgery, which have created both eyes and ears, and even tongues for hundreds of unfortunate beings whom ignorance had heretofore condemned to eternal privation:—and of those who are even "*defective animals*" we can only with certainty say that in the *present* extent of our knowledge, we are ignorant of all means of relief. Nor is it merely a doubtful probability that in the progress of light, the united forces of moral and physical education, may so combine as to prevent altogether, even the appearance of these melancholy disfigurements.

To be convinced of the astonishing physical results and changes which education taking it as we all agree to do, in

its most illimitable sense, has already produced, and is daily producing on different races of organized beings, we have only to look to the different animals, man has subjected to his use; and the improvements and marked peculiarities exhibited both in their physical conformation and habits of action, are truly surprizing, and would afford if necessary an analogy of the most interesting and conclusive value: but enough is to be found in a contemplation of its effects on our own species, to fill the mind with vast and sanguine anticipations of the gradual but certain progression of both the physical and moral perfectabilities of human nature.

At the mere name of this human nature, I see in the bigoted and prejudiced a look of alarm or sneering indication, while it reminds me, that I have a few observations to offer more particularly on its *moral character* and *primitive dispositions* agreeably to the second proposition stated at my commencement.

It appears that all religious creeds, however they may differ upon all other points of faith, are uniformly agreed, that the "heart of man is corrupt and desperately wicked,"—that his *natural* propensities, are base, seeking and generating evil, rather than good—in short, a perfect demon of darkness rather than an angel of light; and it would almost appear, that you held a similar opinion, at least with regard to certain numbers of men, by the following observation: "I can only account for this by saying, that some men are *naturally* base, and others are *naturally* moral," your friends version of which most certainly changes the whole meaning of your sentiment, but is, I confess, in my opinion, alone the truth. But let us try, the truth of this supposition by a fearless appeal to the first principles of this calumniated human nature.

I shall not at this time waste an argument in reply to the cant of religious belief on this subject, as the motives for the institution and cherishing of such a belief are in the present day almost too self evident to need comment.

Looking then at our moral nature in this abstracted point of view, what propensities, dispositions or inclinations do we discover in the perfectly ignorant animal; such being the primitive nature of man before his faculties, have been expanded or called into consciousness, by the impressions of independant impulses, through the inlets of his exterior senses, shall we discover, through this naked piece of sensitive mechanism, in one individual a propensity to excess in the use of intoxicating drinks—in another a disposition to

rob his neighbour, or set his house on fire for amusement, in a third an irresistible inclination to cut his father's throat or roast him alive at a slow fire?

All these atrocities, it may be said, have disgraced the earth. Alas! it is too true that they have, and even yet are not completely banished from it. But I unhesitatingly answer, it is not to any organic arrangement of predetermined disposition in the heart of man, that we shall trace the cause; but we shall discover its source in that pristine darkness, the native lot of every individual, whose nature it is to become enlightened only by the slow step of progressive experience; and in the misapplication through the too imperfect removal of this dark veil of that individual's moral powers of action.

The only original principle appertaining to the human heart, (and I use this term as expressive of the comprehensive seat of organized consciousness) is an aptitude to be impressed with pleasing and painful sensations, and the first experience of these sensations, must be excited by an impulse on some one of our outward senses, by an object, not in an identity of connection with them. Here then in this impression we discover the first germ in the growth of intellect and feeling creating in the seat of consciousness, the sentiments of love for pleasing sensations and a dislike for painful ones; and these two sentiments alone govern the whole empire of human actions, however multiplied, diversified, or extended they may become.

Have all men a similar aptitude to be impressed by the same object, with a similitude of sensation? I think certainly, yes, in absolute fact, but in different degrees of conscious intensity. How happens it then, that men reason and appear to feel so differently on the same subject? Because again the dark veil of ignorance is too imperfectly removed in some minds more than in others, for them to perceive all the impressions made even on themselves, and consequently the object presented is really not the same to them, only because not sufficiently seen and understood in all its properties. The very profound and extensive bearings of this part of our enquiry would lead in their details to too copious and lengthened a range for the present occasion. Suffice to recur to one exemplification, in an example of moral action, which is in fact the principle I wish to develope. Suppose an individual accused of having perpetrated some crimes, before two other individuals, and the evidence of accusation is so conclusive as to determine the minds of the hearers of it, upon the guilt of the accused, and under such decision of

mind, let one of those hearers, leave his fellow and the culprit, when another witness shall come forward with a string of clear evidence to prove that the one convicted, is not the real person who committed the offence; how different would be the ultimate feelings of the two men in a case so simple,—one would have no other idea *until the veil of ignorance was removed which might never happen*, but that of a criminal he should despise and shun, while the other would view an innocent and deeply injured fellow being. In a case like this, we could no more accuse one of these men, with a wilful perversity of mind than the other; for both determined according to the evidence he had received, in strict conformity with the immutable principles of natural justice. How many actions of men are there not, simple in their unravelled detail as the above case, which through circumstances and appearances, have been brought forward, as proofs of their natural depravity.

The principle of susceptibility to the impressions of pleasure and pain, give rise in its operation to two distinct but united relations—one as regards the preservation and gratification of an individual in his personal identity, and the other that of his social connection and dependence on beings constituted like himself. The first we have to prove, to depend on the unchangeable relation between the capacity to receive, and the nature of objects to impart sensations. Does not the same certainty attach to man in his social character? To illustrate this truth I shall appeal at once, rather to the hearts of men, than to the history of past events, or to the doubtful evidence of passing facts. Having then seen, I trust satisfactorily, that the moral aptitude to be excited by painful or pleasing sensations, can alone be in accordance with the nature of the agency acting on it, or in other words, that the human heart must love or hate all those objects that are, or that appear to be, in themselves lovely or hateful: and this certainty is unalterably the same, even where ignorance and appearances deceive it; for where this last occurs, it is simply because the mind in its impatience or darkness assigns properties to an object, it does not really possess—caressing that which is evil under the image of good—or clothing that which is good, in the habiliments of evil. Having, I say, ascertained this truth, I proceed to infer, that the social impulses which lead man to form societies are as immutably a certain consequence of the organic nature of the human heart—compelling it to love that which is lovely in *moral* action, and to hate that which is evil. By

this moral action I understand exclusively the intercourse of one human being with another. I conclude then, that it is necessitated by its sympathetic structure to feel pain and pleasure, at the contemplation of either, in the being of its fellow—to feel happy in the communication of the one, and an anxiety to ameliorate the other; and this too I believe arises in the *inexperience of a first impulse*, uninfluenced by any calculation of after advantages. I am auxious to be clearly on this point, as I know the principle has been much disputed; yet surely to those who have closely observed the nature of man, it is not necessary to develope the detail of human sympathies to prove its existence.

The physical susceptibility to be thus morally excited, does not certainly exist in the constitutions of all men, in the same degree of energy. But I doubt if even a single individual ever existed who was not organized with some share of this *internal sympathetic sense*; yes, not even the most cold-hearted, death-dealing destroyer of his race, whom the blood-stained pages of history has chronicled, but must have had some few human objects of attachment to echo his sympathies to share in his sorrows and in his joys.

That it is an intelligent and self-discriminating faculty unaided by the judging powers of thought, like the chimerical conscience religion has fastened on ignorance—empowered to guide us, blindfold at every step into the right path, no one can possibly contend: but that it is capable of being expanded, by cultivation and reason, to a grasp of benevolence, unknown even to its own original force, many examples may be found, both in history and our own times to fully confirm; while the same sources too, will likewise furnish abundant proofs of its having been too often cramped and blunted, and in some cases of maddened selfishness, even almost totally obliterated. But, say they, who decide on the primitive properties of a first principle, by reflecting on the distorted perversions of it around them, if this be true, how is it that we so continually witness, not only a perfect indifference to the feelings of others, but often a lively pleasure in the contemplation of actual suffering, propelling the beings of such hearts to the infliction of wanton pain, from a delight to watch its agonies; hence, say they, all the cruel sports which men engage in, with so much earnestness—hence the dispositions we see in some children to torment insects and their little play-fellows—and hence, a variety of other assumed propensities to mischief and crime, which religion says, proves man an imp of the devil, and which you

perhaps think, proves some men "naturally base." In the first place, I shall unequivocally deny, that ever the demoniac spirit existed in a *sane* mind, to coolly and deliberately inflict torment or pain, for the mere pleasure of witnessing it—or with the purposed design of exciting that pain. The sole *reflective* motive of every human gratification is pleasure to itself, not *pain* to *another*; and in most of those instances where even the greatest tortures have been inflicted, the sufferings of the victims have scarcely entered the minds of the spectators, so exclusively have they been absorbed in the intensity of their own sensations:—and such will be the fact in all those cruel sports just mentioned, as well as the tormenting habits of certain children. Of the first of these, I shall say, that the ignorant habits of self-gratification, in all those cases where other's sufferings were so neglected, had blinded and almost obliterated the *sympathetic sense*; or, to be more correct, that on those *particular* occasions its voice was stifled by the influence of an uncontrolled feeling; like the fact of a man, who with the most affectionate heart and lively sympathies, has been driven by a paroxysm of anger to commit a most violent injury. Of the second I shall say, that their experience of objects constituted to form their enjoyments was too imperfect to awaken their social sympathies, naturally less acute than those of some other children, or to direct their choice of them. I shall perhaps be reminded of an *Alexander*, a *Tamerlane*, a *Zengis Khan*; of a *Mavius*, a *Caligula*, a *Nero*, and of a long list of other ancient and modern devastating heroes, with all the crimes which have tracked their path of military conquest and anarchy. I shall be reminded of the black catalogue of religious torturings, burnings, and massacres; of the horrid inflictions that have been perpetrated under the name of revenge; in short of all those ferocious mis-doings which man, in the gloom of his darkness, or in the rage of his error-corrupted passions, has stamped on the name and history of his race. To all this I shall say, first as a general truth, that from the very midst of this dreadful spectacle, I behold the spirit of eternal justice emerging, to declare that the sacred law of social sympathy can never even be infringed without involving a reacting convulsion—and that to attempt its abrogation is to threaten universal extinction! I shall say of those few particular individuals, whose general conduct, *as far as we are assured of it*, affords a plausible support to the opinion of a deliberate, disinterested, pleasure in the exercise of wanton cruelty—that even they, intoxicated as it were with

some one overpowering impulse, allied certainly more nearly to the fever of madness, than to the joys of sanity, were carried away by the torrent of their own individual identity of gratification; while at the same time too, were perhaps acted upon by *unseen* motives totally distinct from the feelings of those they were tormenting: and likewise in whose bosom the social faculty had become too weak either to direct perception or to command attention.

It has been related, *but not authenticated*, that **NERO** sang to his lyre while *Rome* by his own order was in flames. Could this be a fact, what else would it decide but that *Nero* was only a madman: and even of this anomaly in human nature, it has also been said, and I think with much less doubtful probability, that at his death,

“ Some hands unseen strewed flowers upon his tomb.” and adds the poet:—

“ Perhaps the weakness of a heart not void
“ Of feeling for some kindness, done when power
“ Had left the wretch an *uncorrupted hour.*”

Of all the atrocities that characterize the acts of warlike conquest, and of religious fanaticism, we can alone say, that the sensitive organ of social humanity had become suspended or extinguished, in some by the causes we have already seen;—in others by a sort of desperate necessity, as with those unfortunate individuals who have been dragged to the trade of desolation by their mis-judging tyrants, who have been compelled to tear up by the roots this sacred impulse, to be enabled to pursue that which was their only refuge for an uncertain preservation of a miserable existence;—lastly, in others frequently by the very excess of a misunderstood zeal for the welfare and supposed future happiness of the beings made to suffer; or else to preserve this supposed good to an aggregate of other beings, by the influence of terrible example;—such we must directly see appertains to much of religious persecution;—and even the cool, calculating, long-cherished schemes of the wildest and blackest revenge, will more often be found to be the offspring of a strong but misdirected sense of retributive justice, than a mere vindictive retaliation for personal injury.

Let me not, however, be misunderstood to be proclaiming an apology for the hypocritical and persecuting bigot, the hope and freedom destroying despot, or the cold-hearted man of narrow selfishness; *their* motives and characters cannot claim respect or protection. I am alone endeavouring

to examine why or how they are bigots, despots, and bad men, by shewing that they are become so through an interested perversion and extinguishment of a social principle of moral action; and also by their overlooking the true objects of human enjoyment, and mis-applying its relations.

I am anxious, warmly anxious, to clear human nature // from the foul stain, with which the ignorant, but more often *interested* views of religious systems, have disgraced it; for most assuredly no doctrine is so eminently calculated, or which has been more powerfully instrumental in obstructing the progress of moral virtue, than that which declares the natural inclinations of the heart to be directed not only to the subversion of all good among men, but to the actual diabolical engendering of all evil! If this doctrine had been possible ever to be true, the race of mankind could not have existed one generation.

If then there be truth in the proposition I have attempted to elucidate, it will appear, that so far from the human heart being *naturally base*, or embued with evil and wicked propensities, it is on the contrary formed with propensities directly the reverse; in as much as *social* good, when known, constitutes one of the most prolific elements of selfish gratification, and as we have aimed to make clear, must be embraced because its nature is to excite sentiments of approbation and love.

It will be remarked, that I have hitherto confined our attention to the abstract or *impulsive* nature of the *social sympathetic principle*. I have sought to prove its existence alone by its own independent operations, and by the consequences of its neglect and perversion. I have not pressed into the illustration all those collateral proofs to its support, which present themselves at every step in the intercourses of social life, those principles of justice that determine the right and the wrong, or the equity of every-day transactions, by an involuntary appeal to the minds of all men. Those principles so immutable in their essence, though so often through ignorance misunderstood and necessarily misdirected, must emanate from that *organic sense*, but do not constitute it. This I would elucidate by remarking that *natural justice* defines and determines all that shall *not* be done between man and man, but does not, can not, or should not determine and command all that *may* be done between men for their mutual happiness. The practice of strict justice comprehends the fulfilment of positive laws or duties, and he who under-

stands and conforms to them can never do *wrong*, but the practice of active virtue comprehends numberless spontaneous services and kindnesses, which can only be influenced by natural justice so far as to restrain it from going wrong: this may be explained, by saying that no law of justice can compel one man to part with his substance or industry to another, without a mutually agreed upon equivalent: but humanity or the *sympathetic sense* would and does often compel men to do both from an irresistible feeling of unreflected impulse—that secret, all embracing link which shoots through the whole range of earthly intelligence, binding the individual soul to the enlarged and multiplied soul of society!

I have already said, this *moral sense* is not a *discriminating* power, and I now repeat for fear of misconception, that it must, like every other sense or feeling of which we are susceptible, be at all times subjected in its practical applications to the controul and direction of the voice of *reason*. I shall not enlarge on all the variety of interested motives—all the most purely selfish advantages, and securities even for self-preservation, which conspire, independent of natural inclination, to lead men to prefer a life of virtue rather than vice: and notwithstanding the constant clamour and endeavour of prejudice and superstition to obscure this truth, thanks to the progress of opinion, their web of sophistry can no longer conceal it.

It is true that in the nomenclature of sectarianism, human action contains scarcely a virtue, and while it elevates and magnifies an insignificant duty or a childish ceremony, it not unfrequently denounces a highly meritorious and extensively useful action. Let us not, however, be deterred, from defining the elementary basis of all morality; and we shall discover it to centre alone in the performance of all those actions which contribute to our own and other's happiness; and that no pleasure or gratification which does not infringe or tend to infringe on another's happiness, can be either a *crime* or *impropriety*;—nor no conduct unless tending to the injury of self and thereby predisposing to *crime*, can be *folly* or *vice*.

Having endeavoured to trace thus far, the principles of man's nature, as bearing on the subject under investigation, and perhaps there are few more interesting and important; what are the conclusive inductions to be drawn from the premises advanced? Simply that "man is first a being of sensation, and then of reflection;" that he is organized with certain capa-

bilities of retaining, combining, and multiplying his sensations, and of constructing from them permanent rules of conduct; that these capabilities are not *physically* of equal powers in all men, but that a judicious and really enlightened system of education would, if not establish a perfect equality in this respect, remove all those obstructions which at present keep one class of beings at so immeasurable a distance from another class, and would indubitably lead to a much greater equalization of individual happiness:—that he is, moreover a being whose susceptibility to pleasing or painful sensation is governed by the properties of the objects acting on it, but that being primitively ignorant he is always liable to mistake one object for another, until that ignorance is removed by a knowledge of all its parts; that he is led to congregate in communities as well from his sympathetic love for his fellow beings, as from a desire to preserve and improve his own existence; but in as much as he is at first ignorant of the application of *all* his faculties, and unable but by experience of ascertaining his relative associations, he is equally liable in his *social* as in his *individual* character to misconception and error in the exercise of his affections, and in consequence but too frequently the imperative law of individual preservation and ill understood happiness have trampled into destruction every law that unites him in society: that to provide a security for the present and a guarantee for the future, it is only necessary to “enlighten his mind and warm his heart.” Remove from him all those strong interested incentives—those almost compulsory inducements to vice and crime, and he would not only no longer commit them, but would be led by his social sympathies, aided by protective laws, to the practice of active benevolence and virtue: and lastly, that the first and most indispensable duties of a correct education, are to cultivate in the *infantine* mind those organic sympathies, or the *moral sense*, rather by a watchful carefulness to guard it from the thorns, and briars, and barrenness of habits of superficial selfishness, than by any preceptive discipline to *teach* it acts of kindness; in order that it may *feel* principles as well as know them; but above all to stamp upon it an inflexible determination to acquire, as far as may be possible, a knowledge of all the properties and bearings of every subject previous to a decision; and never to submit the honest integrity of its own convictions to the mere authority of name or opinion, however hedged round by the sanctity of custom or antiquity: and thus to create for it a pure and

unerring guide to the acquisition of such a knowledge of all the individual and relative associations, which alone can lead to a practice of all the virtues, and to the taste of all the felicity that man, is by nature formed to experience.

Notwithstanding the length of this article, I feel that the subject is by no means exhausted, but I shall here leave it rather as an inducement to excite other minds to it than as a conclusion of the disquisition.

Your sincere friend and admirer,
HARMODIUS.

Note by R. Carlile:—I cannot see that the reasoning of Harmodius shakes my assertion, *that the organization is a sort of fundamental stimulus to the passions of animals.* I readily admit that education tends to correct the evil which I charge upon Dame Nature; but yield me the first principle, that dispositions do in part result from organization, and I will relinquish all contention as to the quantity of good or evil arising therefrom: knowing that it cannot be precisely calculated. Though I blame Dame Nature for a portion of the evil among mankind: I acknowledge, that *the good of society justifies the existence of such laws as shall repress that evil and punish the actor whenever tangible.* What we call *Nature* created *Man*, but did not create him for any ultimate end: for any purpose of what we now call society. Society is instituted by man as an artificial means to increase his pleasurable sensations. Every man is supposed at liberty to shun the compact if he pleases.

ESSAY ON RELIGION.

FOR THE REPUBLICAN.

Take nature's path and mad opinions leave.—POPE.

June 28, 1823.

EVERY thing in existence possesseth substantial properties, which demonstrate to the mind the certainty of its existence. Thus, we may say, matter exists of course; then, it possesseth properties which are, as it were, a mirror through which we may view the reflection of its relative nature. We can form an idea of the particular nature of beings or substances, through no other medium than by acquainting ourselves with their laws, principles, and properties. On spiritual, or religious subjects, we are at a loss for the want of these means: religion being founded on something which the eye cannot

reach, or any other of our senses take hold of, we, of course, find nothing in our zetetic journey, but a dearth of evidence, a barrenness of fact and testimony. How, then, are we to procure any real knowledge of the religious system, of the deity, the grand feature of this system; in whose name so many dogmas have been enforced even at the sacrifice of the lives of millions? The deity is according to the Deists, (who are the most reasonable of all his worshippers) omnipotent: he is likewise, say they, unchangeable: which is, if we have any knowledge of language, a complete contradiction in terms; since that, which is all-powerful, is capable of exhibiting itself, in all the varieties of metamorphosis, of change or form and situation; like Proteus the Sea God, it might assume an infinity of shapes; but that which is unchangeable must, necessarily be limited to a particular mode of being. If the Deity is immutable; there must be an unvaried sameness in the whole tenour of his action, there must exist an eternal permanence, in the nature of his being. That which is immutable, in its nature, must be unsusceptible of modification; therefore, to say, that the deity, is immutable, is no less than disputing his infinite power. Justice is likewise, amongst the number of his attributes; so is mercy: but are not these qualities, like the former, opposed to each other in their nature, and tendency? Is it not, rather surprising that, the Deists should invest and clothe their IDOL, with such contradictory attributes—such discrepant qualities? We cannot bestow upon the deity, a milder name than IDOL: that imaginary being, which is organized, if we may use the word, which is made up, as it were, of the jarring passions and prejudices of his believers, cannot be any thing else than, an idol of the mind; which no reasonable being would stop to worship. The Deistical system, and of course every other religious system, is founded on hypothetical grounds; which are too sandy and fragile in their nature, to keep firm and secure the spiritual structure. All the attributes of the deity, are at war with each other: we cannot find any two that agree. Indeed there is nothing like harmony, in any system of religion; they are all, without one exception, confused and irregular. For any system to be consistently and regularly framed, nature should be the model from which, it ought to be faithfully drawn.

Whenever we lose sight of nature, we immediately wander in the dark; we are deprived of a brilliant beacon, which would, if kept in view, safely guide us through all the turns and windings of life; but if lost sight of, for a single moment, we are sure to stray from the right path: we are certain to be obscured and benighted; and, in the end, we shall be lost in the dreary wilderness of fable and fiction.

The greatest disagreement—the most acrimonious bickering, hath ever existed in the religious world: indeed, it is impossible that a social and unanimous feeling should exist amongst beings, whose minds were deeply embued with superstition, or religion, or any other system, that is formed in contradiction to the rational

system of things. It must be, when enforced, by a corrupt power, the greatest of all possible evils. The gods, and devils of religion, are composed of such jarring elements, that their very nature is in open hostility with man; they pursue and chase him over the earth, until they have exhausted his animal spirits—broken his mental energies, and reduced him to a melancholy state of religious weakness and despondency.

Before the Deist, or the Christian, can reasonably expect any thing like credence being given to his system, its grounds instead of being gratuitous, should be proved and demonstrated. The existence of a supernatural power, should be made evident to the most common mind, so as not to elude the senses even of the ignorant and the careless. But, we know that this cannot be done: we know that the Deity is but a word, an hypothesis, a fiction; therefore, to believe in his existence, is to delude ourselves, to act, not as wise men, but as fools and idiots. We ought to condemn, in the strongest terms, all those religious systems which, the superstitious fury of mankind has built upon this improper notion.

If the Deity is infinite, and if substance and tangibility are foreign to his nature; he is, of course distinct and abstracted from the universe. But, if he is infinite, this cannot be the case; since an infinite being, would fill an infinite space. The universe, is an assemblage of matter in all the varieties, and multiform appearances, which it is usually exhibiting. Matter, is a tangible substance. What is spirit? Now if spirit is not material and substantial, pray what is it? Matter is something; and if spirit differs from it, it must of course be nothing! Thus we have reasoned ourselves, from religion, altogether: we have cleared our minds, of all its dust and rubbish; and, did we know a single being more free from it than we are; we would immediately strive to reach him in scepticism and unbelief.

We despise the narrow and credulous minds of those persons, who can believe in the existence of any other power than that which

Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glowes in the stars, and blossoms in the trees,
Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent.

POPE.

All ideas about a superior power to the laws and energies of matter are merely fanciful, and, to a reasonable mind ridiculous. Nature, or matter always did exist, it cannot be destroyed. This the chemist can easily prove. Nature may be compared to a great and stupendous machine, which is continually crushing its present forms; instantly reproducing them in a new shape; and furnished with a new being, entirely different from that in which they recently existed. The poet gives a very correct and pleasing description of the changes to which man is subject in the following lines:

Like leaves on trees the race of man is found,
Now green in earth now withering on the ground,

Another race the following spring supplies;
 They fall successive and successive rise:
 So generations in their course decay,
 So flourish these when those are past away.

POPE'S HOMER.

Religion seems to overthrow every thing that philosophy would support, or our own reason maintain: philosophy assists every thing that is really good—*aids* all the parts of the human system, and binds together in mutual amity all her votaries; but it never did never can acknowledge any power superior to the eternal laws of the universe. Priests may trouble the ignorant and the credulous with their doctrines about awful and terrifying Gods, Devils, &c. whilst the philosopher will smile at the absurdity of their vagaries and pity the weakness of those who believe them. The idea of an infinite power being susceptible of those passions which exclusively belong to finite beings, is palpably absurd. Wrath, jealousy, and other human passions, are said, at times, to take possession of the bosom of the Deity; but to ascribe to the Deity these qualities and to say that he is influenced by them, is to clothe him with something which cannot really make a part of his nature: thus confounding the assumed Creator with the real creature itself. In Lord Byron's "Cain" the finest and purest of all our dramas; there is the following truism:

"Man's vast fears and little vanity
 Would make him cast upon the spiritual nature,
 His own low feelings."

When the human mind shall be free from all ideas about supernatural beings; or at least when mankind cease to place any reliance on them, then will the true millennium arrive; the past will be forgotten; the present more enjoyed; and the future more earnestly but less painfully anticipated. The evils which afflict mankind will vanish with their fears: their sorrows, and their troubles, will be buried in the obscuring womb of time; leaving nothing behind them but what contributes to the happiness of every human being.

The pale and meagre victim of persecution, will be set free; the hue of health and liberty will revive on his cheek; his heart will throb with exquisite feelings; something like disappointment will in spite of himself occasionally appear in his looks, from his having been reconciled to end his days on the straw of his dungeon: the contending feelings which will vibrate in his frame, at seeing himself freed from a long and hopeless captivity, at finding his fellows, rejoicing over the grave of his oppression, will be enough to break the strongest cord of life, and shake it from the mansion which contains it.

EPICURUS.

Newton, near Manchester.

MONARCHY, OR POLITICAL REFLECTIONS.

(Concluded from page 791, Vol. 7.)

PART III.*

'Twill be in vain of princes to complain,
While any plans of Monarchy remain;
However men refit, and new arrange,
'Tis but the actors and the scenes that change,
It is in vain that we the actors blame,
While the old drama still remains the same.

THERE appears to be two principles in the mind, moral and immoral, and as either prevail the individual is virtuous, or vicious, so also there are two principles warring against each other in every Monarchy; one is the spirit of despotism and is immoral, the other is the moral spirit of Republicanism acting as a conscience, and continually pointing out the errors and misconduct of the rulers.

It may not be amiss, before I proceed further, to make some inquiries concerning the origin of Monarchy, and how kings first came by their titles; for it appears, that every country was once a Republic; that being the form of Government which man in his natural state would naturally adopt, as he would have to give up no right that was not better lost than retained.

"On our discovery of America," says Voltaire, "all the several tribes throughout that vast part of the world, were found divided into Republics; but there were only two kingdoms. Of a thousand nations only two were subdued."

It is most probable that those two nations were subdued, as this eminent writer terms it, not by force of arms, but by the bribes and insinuations of some artful foreigners, who under pretences to serve them, served themselves, by making themselves hereditary masters of their Commonwealths; in much the same manner as an Indian tribe in Pennsylvania, sold the whole of their land to William Penn for a few pins, needles, spoons, &c., and were afterwards scorned and despised by all the surrounding tribes, who looked upon them as unworthy of their society, and undeserving any protection; so they wandered about like vagabonds, making life still more bitter by anticipating the curse of their posterity.

There is only one way by which a man can obtain rightfully the title of King, and no rightful way by which he can obtain hereditary succession.

A man may, at the head of an overwhelming army invade a Com-

* The Printer committed an error with the last article, it should have been headed Part II.

monwealth, and by mere force of arms raise himself to royal, or imperial dignity; but such a man would be a usurper, a robber, and every Citizen, who had not been base enough to treat or enter into any compact with him, would have the same right to destroy him as he would to destroy a thief who had entered his house with the intent to steal his property. The noble minded Romans exercised this right against their usurper Julius Cæsar, and the English should have exercised it against William the Norman, instead of proclaiming themselves cowards, and slaves, by conferring on the usurper and robber, the title of King or Conqueror. Such a King is a military despot; the cabinet which he consults is the camp, the sceptre which he wields is the sword; and the throne on which he sits is a monument of blood, to defend which, a constant supply of human blood is required, and which must be obtained by the continual immolation of the wisest and bravest of the Citizens.

The period of 1688, exhibits another method of raising a man to a throne. There we see two powerful parties of borough and landed proprietors, madly contending for place, and consequently for the national purse. The villainous Tories, then, as now, were mean enough to flatter and fawn round a bigoted, ignorant, and cruel wretch, James the Second; while the cowardly Whigs, instead of boldly appealing to the energies of the English people, who would gladly have seized the opportunity to depose their tyrant, and again have set up a Commonwealth, basely and insultingly invited a Dutchman, William of Nassau, to assist them in turning James and the Tories out! Thus insulting the nation, by proclaiming that England had not courage and wisdom sufficient to manage her own internal affairs, without calling in the assistance of an ignorant foreigner! I say ignorant, for what could he know about the laws, and customs, and the genius of the people of this country? But this was no consideration with the Whigs: they, like all conquerors, considered the means would be lost in the splendour of the achievement, and boldly mounted on the back of the King of their own manufacturing, on whom they triumphantly rode to the revolutionary throne, grasping both the crown and church lands, in their journey into office, where they took full possession of all the good things which are there to be found! After dividing the crown lands, among themselves, and saddling their new king on the people to receive an annual salary, which placed him in the situation of a wretched hireling depending for his very existence on the aristocracy, they impudently proclaimed this disgraceful and wicked contrivance to be a "Glorious Revolution!" I wonder, that the present Whigs, having this successful experiment, and glorious event before their eyes, do not look out for some royal adventurer, some Duke of Angouleme, with whose assistance they may be as successful as their Whig ancestors, by driving the present obstinate, and insolent Tories, from their usurped citadel. I see no alternative: they have lost the confidence of the English people, and had better make their appeal to foreigners.

The only way by which any man can rightfully obtain the title of

King, or Emperor, is the free suffrage of the people, of the whole people, or at least of the majority of all who are competent to judge for themselves.

This principle was acted upon in France, November 10, 1799. Napoleon Buonaparte, was elected first consul, by the astounding number, of 3,011,009; there appeared against him only the small number, of 1,362. Upon the same principle, I believe, France gave, and Napoleon received the imperial diadem. So far France had a right to give, and so far had Napoleon a right to receive; but when they came to the question of hereditary succession, one party had no right to give, and the other no right to receive; therefore, in this case, moral, as well as natural justice, was violated, while the rights and liberties of posterity were grossly infringed. Nor would the children of such a state, when they should arrive at the years of maturity, owe the least allegiance to such a monarch, for to them he would be only an usurper.

It is upon this principle, that the claim of universal suffrage, and annual elections, is founded: and till this claim be conceded, every Government of every country must, and does employ despotic power.

Every thing under a Monarchical Government, is made a job. The whole business of the church is a mere job; by which the priesthood continually drain the money from the pockets of the people. Were the people to withhold their supplies, only a month, not a parson would be found to preach; every pulpit in the kingdom would be deserted, and all their cant about the immortal soul would cease; for, finding that no money came forth, they would very soon begin to doubt the existence of a God, and perhaps turn infidels, in order to try what success they would meet with on the other side of the question: nay, it is pretty certain, that if the Devil could bestow on them as many of the good things of this world, as their worldly dispositions covet, they would fall down and worship him.

The same may be said of the bar; the lawyers will say or swear that black is white, for money, but, without money, they will neither plead nor give advice. The only Deity which they worship is gold*;

* My friend Davenport lays too much stress upon money. Will he make or mend shoes without money, or something as an equivalent in value and for use? To acquire as much property as possible, is the ruling motive of every man, and a very correct motive: all we want is, that quantity of moral legislation that shall prevent one man from unjustly preying upon the property of another. Rather than condemn a man for a disposition to acquire property, he ought to be, by all means encouraged to do it; particularly, where it is acquired by industry and new productions. All that we want in the way of reform, and all that we can have to be useful, is to be able to make what application we please of what property we fairly acquire: instead of giving up three fourths of it to a taxgatherer or to lawyers as a premium for bad laws. Poverty, then, would only be found allied to idleness and disability to labour; and under such a state of things, that would be a base principle that created an antipathy between rich and poor. Property is a criterion for happiness in a general sense, and money is but one of many kinds of property.

R. C.

and if we may judge by their actions, in no other do they believe. Their consciences are so often stretched, that they lose all their elastic powers, like a bow that has been too long bent. Whether they believe their client in the right or in the wrong, is no consideration with them, all they wish to know is, the length of his purse. If that answers their greedy wishes, they would, if they could, kick both justice and law out of court, to rescue a notorious villain from that punishment, which they believe at the same moment he richly deserves. Nay, their maxim is, the more guilty he appears, the greater their merit in robbing justice of her claim: and for the same reasons they will strain every nerve, and call every faculty into action to obtain the condemnation of an innocent man*.

Wars, which are peculiar to Monarchies, are jobs of the most dreadful description. In these all the laws of nature are reversed. It is not only royally lawful to murder, but glorious! It is not only royally lawful, to shut up whole cities, and then cut off all the supplies, thereby condemning thousands of men, women and children, to die by the lingering tortures of starvation; but meritorious! And for which the sanguinary ruffians, bestow thanks, and rewards on each other! What can be more unnatural, more savage, more brutal than to set about robbing, plundering, and murdering the whole population of two innocent nations, merely because two robbers of the Royal banditti happened to fall out about the spoil?

It may here be said, that Republics wage war as well as Monarchies. That the Roman Republic, carried on wars as well as imperial Rome, I will not deny; but the former, certainly had always a better cause, and while she fought liberty, foreign nations received her more like a friend than an enemy; and in all her affairs she always observed the strictest economy, which is the beauty and strength of every system, and every Government. Surely, it would be absurd to suppose that a Republic would have carried on a war for twenty years, expended a thousand millions of money, wrung from the hard handed labourers of the present generation, and at the same time have saddled another thousand millions upon posterity, which will insure oppression and slavery until time shall be no more; at least, such is the intention of its infamous contractors, merely to set up kings in other countries!

Here again, it may be said, that a Republic has waged war, and expended her wealth to put down kings in other countries. The events that have taken place both in America, and in Europe, during the last fifty years will warrant that assertion; but it cannot be denied that the money that would set up one king, would be sufficient to put down twenty! Five millions judiciously laid out would put down any king in Europe; but would an hundred millions, or double that sum, set up a king in America? No, no, the brave Americans have purchased their liberty, at too great a price to be easily persuaded to return the management of their affairs into the hands of such

* Witness the conduct of Mr. Denman in the cases of Humphrey Boyle, and the Reverend Doctor Jephson.

madmen ! The Cortes of Spain were perfectly correct when they voted King Ferdinand insane ; it was when they pronounced him recovered, that they committed error !

That all Kings are mad, in a more or less degree, may be easily known by comparing their symptoms, with the symptoms, of mad people in general. One of the leading characteristics of persons who are insane is their utter aversion to every thing which, before their madness, was the object of their most anxious solicitude and undivided attachment; another is, be the individual ever so obscure and humble when sane, the moment he loses his reason, he fancies himself a king, an emperor, a mogul, or something the highest in rank that he had any knowledge of when in his senses; and in order to convince those about him what he is, or rather what he imagines himself to be, he crowns himself with a crown of straw, or reeds, or whatever he can procure ; he next provides himself with a royal sceptre, no matter of what material ; a bean stalk, a reed, or a rotten stick do equally well : and an old blanket is a sufficient substitute for the imperial purple ! When thus clad, and equipped, he decrees laws for, and assumes the command of all those who are not quite so mad as himself ; meanwhile, extending his sceptre, and raising himself several inches higher than his natural height, he looks down with a contemptuous grin, with all the self-sufficiency of imperial majesty on all below !

Now, with respect to kings : does not the present age furnish us with examples, of men who when raised to a throne, not only turned their backs upon, but discovered an incurable hatred for those who before their elevation were their bosom friends and inseparable companions ; and replaced them with men, who, previous to their ascension, were the objects of their scorn and detestation ?

In the next symptom, there is certainly some difference in the king and the poor maniac before described, which is natural enough : but, at the same time, it goes to prove, that the disorder is very nearly the same. The king does not talk about crowns, sceptres, and robes as the other does, because he is secure in the possession and high in reality, as the humble madman fancies himself to be. A king therefore, talks about much higher things, such for instance, as having a divine right to rob and plunder as many people as he can, by force of arms, bring under his yoke ; that he is answerable for his conduct to God alone : that he is immortal, and consequently cannot die, and that it impossible for him to do wrong ! He calls all the land, containing nearly an hundred million people, his dominions, just as if he were the great national landlord, and all this vast mass of people were his tenants at will, or his slaves ; whereas, in reality, he does not possess an acre of land that he can call his own. If the people murmur, and refuse to administer to royal pleasures, and lusts ; kings say they have a right, and frequently exercise it, to order their armed slaves to slaughter men, women, and children in cold blood, for their amusement ! This is the language, and practice of kings, and if this be not madness, I should like to know what is ? The

only difference is, that all the evils arising from the madness of the mock king center in himself; whilst the evils arising from the madness of a real king are scattered over a whole country, and often through many countries. Therefore, the mad-mock-king is the lesser evil of the two, and to be preferred to the kingly mock-madman!

For the benefit of those who may still doubt, I will make an extract or two from the speech of a royal madman, in the year 1616, in the Star Chamber. James the First, addressing himself particularly to his Judges, speaks in the following manner:—“From this imitation of God and Christ, in whose throne we sit, the Government of all Common-wealths, and especially Monarchies, hath been from the beginning settled and established. Kings are properly Judges, and judgment properly belongs to them from God; for kings sit in the throne of God and thence all judgement is derived. That which concerns the mystery of the King’s power is not lawful to be disputed; for that is to wade into the weakness of princes, and to take away the mystical reverence that belongs unto them that sit on the throne of God. It is Atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do: good Christians content themselves with his will revealed in his word: so it is high contempt and presumption in a subject to dispute what a King can do, or say that a King cannot do this or that; and not to rest in that which is the King’s revealed will in his law.” No one, I presume, can doubt of the madness of the King who delivered the above speech: then how much more mad still must be his son Charles the First, who attempted to reduce this theory to practice, but in doing which he grew so outrageously mad, that his subjects, for their own personal safety, were obliged to put him to an ignominious death? His son, James the Second, was so affected with the same malady, that he was driven from the country as a mad dog. This likewise proves that royal madness is more hereditary than royal wisdom; that it descends through all their generations; and is the reason, perhaps why, though some kings are more and some less afflicted with this calamity, no body ever heard of a radical cure being performed on a mad king, but in his death. I have been informed by eminent physicians, that very low diet, severe flogging and other corporeal punishments are absolutely necessary for the restoration of the mental faculties! This is certainly very harsh treatment; but when our reasoning powers are in a state of derangement, what sacrifice can be too great for the re-establishment of that greatest of all blessings? I would therefore advise the state physicians of every country, where there is a King, to try the discipline above described on their royal and imperial patients; for who knows, but the much desired millennium depends on the curing of kings of their insanity! Not that it would much matter, whether a king was afflicted with madness, folly, or knavery, or all three together, as some are; were not these disorders epidemical, and likely to affect, in a more or less degree, all ranks of the community, from the King down to the petty constable.

The old adage, "that one fool makes many," is particularly exemplified in monarchies;—because one man in the state sits in a gilded chair, which for the sake of pomp is called a throne, and wears a sort of fool's-cap or crown studded all over with shining particles of various colours, hundreds of others must sit in gilded chairs, and wear fool's-caps, which in their mimicry they call coronets or little crowns.

Here I will take the liberty to introduce a new phrase, that, one knave makes many, as well as one fool: for the knavery which is sometimes practised in the lower ranks of society, is only an imitation of the upper ranks and this imitation of vice, folly and knavery, which always rages particularly in monarchies, may be fairly termed a national madness; a distemper which once rooted in the habit, can never be thoroughly cured without the application of that terrible remedy "Revolution!" That when in the hands of skilful physicians is a certain cure for all national diseases; but when applied by quacks destroys as much as it saves, and leaves the patient's health in a very precarious state. Witness the "Ruins of Empires" as Castlereagh called Spain and Portugal. All royal and aristocratical titles, and all priesthood or compulsory payment to the priests, should be put down; and industry exempted from taxation so long as there was any unclaimed property to proceed upon for the necessary expences of good Government.

By not taking the whole of the property of the Church and King in Spain and Portugal for the purposes of good Government, the Priests and Kings have been able to wield that which was left to the distraction of those Governments. Let this be a lesson, a warning to future representative legislatures.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR, London, July, 1823.

I TOLD you that I would keep a sharp look out after all your persecutors; one of whom was tried for SODOMY, at Cambridge on Wednesday the 23d instant. This monster's name is Thomas Jephson. He is a Reverend Divine. What do you think of that? He is a most Noble Resident Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College! Do you hear this? I am not acquainted with the particulars of this trial; but, I have been informed that the whole of the proceedings are so disgusting, that they cannot be laid before the public! If I had my will they should be published.

And now, Sir, I will, for the present, leave this disgusting concern; and give you a copy of a charge, that has been given, by the Right Reverend Father in God the Bishop of London, to the Clergy of his Diocese. This Bishop is a member of the Society that brought you to trial; fined and sent you to Gaol; seized and destroyed all your property. Ah! even sold the bed from

under your wife, turned her into the street, and then sent her to Gaol. When I think of this infamous conduct of your persecutors, and that is very often, I am so vexed that I can do nothing. If I have the pen, hammer, wax, or awl, in my hand, down I throw it.

This reverend black-coat and black-heart Bishop, said, when the Queen was tried, that the King can do no wrong. Very well then, I will not quarrel with him for saying that. But, if the King can do no wrong, I will soon show you that this *mitred head and heart* has done wrong.

HERE IS THE CHARGE.

No 1, *An Exact Copy.*

REVEREND SIR,

IN obedience to his Majesty's Commands, I require you to read in your Church or Chapel, immediately after Divine Service, the King's Letter, a Copy of which I have caused to be transmitted to you.

You will read the King's Letter on Sunday the 27th instant, if received in due time, if not on the Sunday following.

Several of the members of the first sentence are out of their proper places. The phrase "the King's letter" ought to have been written after "to read." The Bishop has told his tithe Gentlemen *where* they are to read the letter; but, you will see that he was obliged to begin another sentence to tell them *when* to read it.

The advantages derived to the children of the poor, and through them to society at large from the institutions thus recommended by his Majesty, are probably exhibited in your own parish, and certainly within the range of your neighbourhood; and whether exhibited in your own parish or in your neighbourhood, I am persuaded you will endeavour to extend *them* through the means recommended in his Majesty's letter to the utmost of your power.

In this sentence the conjunction, *that*, is omitted after "persuaded." What does the objective pronoun **THEM** stand for in

No. 2, *A Copy Corrected by me.*

REVEREND SIR,

IN obedience to his Majesty's Commands, I require you to read the King's Letter, in your Church or Chapel, immediately after Divine Service, on Sunday the 27th instant, if received in due time, if not on the Sunday following. I have caused a copy of His Majesty's Letter to be transmitted to you.

The advantages derived to the children of the poor, and through them to society at large, from the institutions thus recommended by his Majesty, are probably exhibited in your own parish, and certainly within the range of your neighbourhood; but, whether exhibited in your own parish or in your neighbourhood, I am persuaded that you will endeavour to extend the institutions, through the means recommended in His Majesty's Letter, to the utmost of your power.

this sentence? I will tell you. It stands for parish and neighbourhood: very well then; the grammatical meaning is, that the King has recommended to these Reverend Gentlemen to extend their parishes and neighbourhoods! What do you think of this? I dare say that they will, strictly, attend to His Most Gracious Majesty's recommendation; and, more particularly so, if they can extend their tithes too!

We have no occasion to wonder at people building at such a rate; for here is the King, so the Bishop says, recommending the clergy to extend their parishes and neighbourhoods! They may extend the buildings; but, cunning as they are, they will be puzzled to extend their parishes.

I pray God to prosper in your hands, this and every other good work.

From your Affectionate Brother,

W. LONDON.

I pray that God may prosper this, and every other good work in your hands.

From your Affectionate Brother,

JAMES HALL.

We have been told over and over again, by all the tithe-eaters, that God is in heaven; and, that heaven is above, that is over our heads. Now, Sir, what infamous lies these tithe gentlemen must have told us; because this Bishop tells his affectionate brethren that *they have God in their hands*. And, what is still more curious, he says that God has been unfortunate, unprosperous, unlucky of late; and, that, he hopes that God will prosper in future. This is the grammatical meaning of the Bishop's last sentence! He is the foreman of the gang that put you into Gaol; therefore let us put his *talents on record*, for our children to read when we are in our graves.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

JAMES HALL.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR, London, July 17, 1823.
My wish is to assist you. If any thing that I have written and sent, is of the least service to you, I shall be glad. I would advise you not to pay the tyrannical scoundrels, one penny of your fines, if you can, in any way, get out without paying. But at any rate, for the benefit of your health, get out if you can. The people are so deluded by the base crew that oppresses them, that it will take some time before a majority of them will be sensible, even for their own *immediate* good. One thing I am certain of, that is, that after a man has arrived at the knowledge of Materialism, he will never again be deluded by any cunning Nobleman or Priest.

I have, now, more pleasure than I ever had in my life. I am constantly studying how I can benefit mankind. For, this know-

ledge I am greatly obliged to you. You have made me study till I am a perfect Materialist. When I was what is usually called a religious man, I was constantly uneasy; always afraid of the Devil; thought he was coming for me if I only heard a mouse.

And, now, Sir, let me congratulate you for the effects produced by your honesty. You have worked wonders. I, out of curiosity only, went into seven churches and chapels on Sunday last; and in each, the Parson was hard at work, to keep his tithes, proving the existence of a God. At one place in Jewin Street, next door to the Freethinkers, a man was preaching or rather roaring and gaping most monstrously. I laughed heartily. He was all against you; but he did not mention your name. At another place, the Parson told the congregation three of the most barefaced lies, that I ever heard in my life.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,
JAMES HALL.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

London, July 31, 1823.

THERE is a right and a wrong, a pleasant and an unpleasant, way to do every thing; therefore I am very desirous, at this critical time, to instil on the mind of every man who professes Materialism what I conceive to be the right and the pleasant way for him to act, he must always keep his object in view, that is, to satisfy and convince his hearers of the truth of what he tells them; and let him do this pleasantly and cheerfully, and never, on any account, fly in a passion, because his object is to do good to his fellow creatures, without pay or reward; and, his own mind will tell him that though he has been so unfortunate as not to convince them of their errors, yet he will be satisfied that he has disinterestedly done his duty to them. He must also call to mind, the many hours that he has most profoundly studied, before he could satisfy himself of the non-existence of any supernatural being. And also firmly impress on the minds of his hearers, the very great difficulty that every man experiences in obtaining sound knowledge.

Very few of our forefathers ever studied at all; at least, this is the opinion that I have formed by reading their works. I think, I may venture to say that not one out of every twenty thousand even thought for himself. They were led by the nose just the same as the Methodists of the present day are. Let any sensible intelligent man go into any Methodist Chapel, he will there hear the parson *tell* his congregation some audacious *lies*; while they sit sighing, and really believing every word that he delivers. This is all for the want of thought on the part of the hearers. If they were only to think for a moment, and, if they would but just ask themselves, what the soul is, what it is made of, where it resides; their minds will soon satisfy them that they have been imposed upon. That those who talk about souls, heaven, and hell, are receiving mil-

lions of money every year, for practising this deception; and that the moment a majority of the people are sensible of their error, of their complete delusion, they will not work hard all day for the Noblemen and Parsons to come at night under a cloak of saving their souls, but in reality to take away all that they have earned during the day, for them (the Parsons and Noblemen) to expend in grand routs and balls, some of which cost five or six thousand pounds; whilst those who have earned every penny of this money are clothed in old sacks with hay-bands round their legs instead of having stockings on.

When every Materialist has made his pupil sensible of all this deception, he may then begin to show how the Noblemen are acting at the present time; that they have placed in the Army, since 1816, the following young gentlemen who are all sons of Noblemen. Namely:

<i>1st Life Guards.</i>	<i>Major</i>	<i>8th Light Dragoons</i>	<i>Cornet</i>
Earl of Uxbridge	<i>Captain</i>	Hon. C. Westernd	
Hon. C. L. Legge	<i>Captain</i>	<i>9th Light Dragoons</i>	
Lord Bingham	<i>Captain</i>	Hon. G. Vaughan	<i>Cornet</i>
Hon. Fitzgerald Roos	<i>Lieut.</i>	Hon. Lascelles	<i>Cornet</i>
Hon. Upton	<i>Cornet</i>		
Hon. Leeson	<i>Cornet</i>		
Hon. Lawe	<i>Cornet</i>		
<i>2d Life Guards.</i>	<i>Captain</i>		
Viscount Barnard	<i>Captain</i>	Lord T. Cecil	<i>Captain</i>
Lord Bentinck	<i>Captain</i>	Earl of Wiltshire	<i>Lieut.</i>
Lord Muncaster	<i>Cornet</i>	Earl of Yarmouth	<i>Lieut.</i>
<i>Royal Horse Guards.</i>	<i>Captain</i>	Hon. Watson	<i>Lieut.</i>
Lord Lennox	<i>Lieut.</i>	Sir John Trollope, Bt.	<i>Lieut.</i>
Lord Hill	<i>Cornet</i>	Lord Charles Fitzroy	<i>Cornet</i>
Hon. Hill	<i>Cornet</i>		
Hon. Wellesley	<i>Cornet</i>		
Hon. H. Wellesley	<i>Cornet</i>		
<i>1st Dragoon Guards.</i>	<i>Cornet</i>		
Sir Gerald Aylmer, Bt.	<i>Cornet</i>	<i>12th Light Dragoons.</i>	
<i>3rd Dragoon Guards.</i>	<i>Cornet</i>	Hon. Vincent Rose	<i>Lieut.</i>
Hon. Abercromby	<i>Cornet</i>	<i>13th Light Dragoons.</i>	
<i>4th Dragoon Guards.</i>	<i>Lieut.</i>	Sir J. Gordon, Bt.	<i>Captain</i>
Hon. Shore	<i>Lieut.</i>	Hon. J. Stuart	<i>Lieut.</i>
<i>5th Dragoon Guards</i>	<i>Lieut.</i>		
Sir H. Acton, Bt.	<i>Lieut.</i>	<i>14th Light Dragoons.</i>	
Hon. J. Kennidg	<i>Lieut.</i>	Sir Thos. Armsby, Bt.	<i>Captain</i>
<i>1st Royal Dragoons.</i>	<i>Cornet</i>	Sir K. Jackson, Bt.	<i>Lieut.</i>
Sir L. Powell Bt.	<i>Cornet</i>		
<i>2d Dragoons.</i>	<i>Cornet</i>	<i>15th Hussars.</i>	
Hon. Wyndham	<i>Cornet</i>	Sir W. Jolliffe, Bt.	<i>Lieut.</i>
<i>3d Dragoons.</i>	<i>Cornet</i>	Sir H. Jolliffe	<i>Lieut.</i>
Sir W. White, Bt.	<i>Cornet</i>	<i>17th Light Dragoons</i>	
<i>7th Hussars.</i>	<i>Captain</i>	Lord F. Conyngham	<i>Lieut.</i>
Hon. G. Molineux	<i>Captain</i>	Hon. H. Massey	<i>Cornet</i>
Hon. G. Straungways	<i>Captain</i>		
Earl of Belfast	<i>Lieut.</i>	<i>1st Foot Guards.</i>	
Lord A. Paget	<i>Cornet</i>	Hon. F. Needham	<i>Captain</i>
Lord Hopes	<i>Cornet</i>	Sir M. Burgoyne, Bt.	<i>Lieut.</i>

<i>3d Foot Guards.</i>		<i>51st Foot.</i>	
Hon. C. Westernd	<i>Lieut.</i>	Sir William Scott, Bt.	<i>Ensign</i>
Hon. B. Phipps	<i>Lieut.</i>	53d Foot.	
Hon. E. Stopford	<i>Captain</i>	Hon. F. Curzon	<i>Lieut.</i>
<i>4th Foot.</i>		55th Foot.	
Hon. M. Arbuthnott	<i>Lieut.</i>	Hon. R. Rous	<i>Captain</i>
<i>7th Foot.</i>		58th Foot.	
Lord William Poulet	<i>Lieut.</i>	Hon. R. Peter	<i>Ensign</i>
Lord William Thynne	<i>Lieut.</i>	59th Foot.	
<i>8th Foot.</i>		Hon. J. Amherst	<i>Lieut.</i>
Hon. R. Hare	<i>Ensign</i>	60th Foot.	
<i>10th Foot.</i>		Hon. H. Hervey	<i>Lieut.</i>
Hon. R. Molyneux	<i>Lieut.</i>	62d Foot.	
<i>15th Foot.</i>		Lord F. Lennox	<i>Ensign</i>
Hon. G. Brown	<i>Ensign</i>	69th Foot.	
<i>18th Foot.</i>		Hon. R. King	<i>Lieut.</i>
Lord Wallscourt	<i>Lieut.</i>	71st Foot.	
<i>20th Foot.</i>		Viscount Falkland	<i>Ensign</i>
Hon. G. Keppel	<i>Lieut.</i>	84th Foot.	
Lord E. Hay	<i>Lieut.</i>	Hon. F. Forbes	<i>Ensign</i>
<i>22d Foot.</i>		85th Foot.	
Hon. F. Cavendish	<i>Ensign</i>	Hon. James Stuart	<i>Ensign</i>
<i>25th Foot.</i>		Lord Crofton	<i>Ensign</i>
Hon. A. Cathcart	<i>Ensign</i>	Hon. C. Berkeley	<i>Ensign</i>
<i>28th Foot.</i>		<i>Rifle Brigade.</i>	
Lord J. Lennox	<i>Ensign</i>	Hon. C. Blayney	<i>Ensign</i>
<i>37th Foot.</i>		Hon. Stewart	<i>Ensign</i>
Hon. A. Brown	<i>Ensign</i>	<i>Cape Corps.</i>	
<i>43d Foot.</i>		Lord Loughborough	<i>Captain</i>
Lord Chichester	<i>Ensign</i>	Lord Yarmouth	<i>Captain</i>
Sir B. Fletcher, Bt.	<i>Ensign</i>		

The Noblemen of this nation are receiving nearly four millions in sinecures and pensions every year. It is the Army that forces the sum from the people; *therefore* you will here see that ninety noblemen have placed their sons in the Army since 1816. You will also see that the Earl of Uxbridge is a Major in the 1st Life Guards.

4th Dragoon Guards, James Shaw, Lieutenant, 22d October, 1799. Now my friends this Gentleman was actually a Lieutenant *before* the Earl of Uxbridge *was born*. Lieutenant Shaw has been with his Regiment wherever it has been ordered, so I have been informed, and is now doing duty with it. You may see by what I have here stated, that the noblemen are determined to keep us in our present ragged state, till we have courage to let them know that we will not submit to be degraded any longer.

My friends, Materialists, I wish you to pay particular attention to what I shall here state; and impress it deeply on the minds of your pupils.

Each horse-soldier costs the nation six shillings a day, that is as much as twelve labourers have daily in the country, and each infantry soldier about three shilling and six-pence a day. Your pupils may want to know the particular charges of this enormous sum for each man. You may begin by telling them, that the pay of each cavalry soldier is one shilling and four-pence a day, that

the keep of the horse amounts to two shillings a day, at least that sum was allowed to each officer for the keep of his horse during the last month. Each soldier has clothing, boots, a great coat that cost about two pounds, arms and accoutrements found him. That every eight men have three bushels and a peck of coals and three pounds of candles weekly. That the horse costs twenty-five guineas; and I have reckoned it to last ten years; then there is its saddle, furniture and so on. Then we must reckon the Barracks building and keeping in repair, sinking wells for pumps, barrack furniture, bedding, Barrack Master and Barrack Serjeant's pay; then we must add one thousand a year allowed to the General for what is called off reckonings; we must also add two hundred a year allowed for wine for the Officers Mess. I think I have stated enough already to satisfy you that I have not over-rated the charge of the soldier. But, I could go on for an hour longer and then not be able to enumerate all the expence to the public, for these fine gentlemen.

Every Materialist who has read me thus far, will be able to satisfy his pupils how their property is taken from them. And, now, he may *begin* with the *Bible*, which I strongly recommend every Christian to read. Select here and there a verse; beginning at 16th chapter of Genesis and go on according to Mr. Carlyle's penny list of references. But more particularly, point out the 38th chapter of Genesis, and 9th verse; read also the 17th verse of the 31st chapter of Numbers.

I began this letter by writing about souls, and I have finished it by recommending the *Bible*. My reason for doing this, is that when you have impressed a *doubt* on your pupil's mind *about his soul*, leave him in that doubtful state. Do not help him out. It will make him study; which is for his own benefit, and during the time that he is studying, point out the army and how his property is taken from him by the Noblemen and Parsons, under a cloak of religion!

I would rather be three months in converting a man, as the hypocrite Methodists call it, than three days; because in the former I should be sure that my pupil had studied for himself; and in the latter, I should be satisfied that he had never studied at all; and, that the moment he heard a better story, or a story that pleased him better than mine, he would change again.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

JAMES HALL.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G. D. of Birmingham has been received and the principal suggestions will be acted upon.

The miniature edition of Paine's Theological Works is now selling in bds. with Portrait and Vignette Title Page at 4s.

We have received the Characters from *Philanthropos* and will attend to them; but some weeks must necessarily elapse before they can appear in print. Reasons shall be assigned in a note to *Philanthropos*.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 5, Water Lane, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican" to be left at the place of publication.